REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the grounds that the element "storage 18" mentioned in the description was not shown in the drawings. (Office Action, pg. 2) Applicants amended para. [0014] on pg. 5 of the Specification to change "storage 18" to "storage 16" to overcome this objection.

The Examiner objected to the drawings on the grounds that the reference character 90 in FIG. 6 was not mentioned in the description. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants amended para. [0025] on pg. 9 of the Specification to add reference character 90 to overcome this objection.

Applicants submit that the amendments to the written description overcome the objections to the drawings.

The Examiner objected to claim 19 as depending on claim 1 and suggested amending claim 19 to depend from claim 13. (Office Action, pgs. 3-4) Applicants amended claim 19 as the Examiner suggested to depend from claim 13 to overcome this objection.

Applicants added a period to the end of claim 8 and removed the "and" as suggested by the Examiner (on pg. 4 of the Office Action) to overcome the objections thereto.

1. Claims 1, 5-13, 17-23, and 27-34 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 5-13, 17-23, and 27-34 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) as obvious over Bonner (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0029211) in view of Bastawala (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,457). Applicants traverse for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 13, and 23 concern making data available to an application program, and require: generating a cursor positioned with respect to a result table, wherein the cursor specifies a search criteria, wherein the result table includes rows from a base table that satisfy the search criteria; receiving a fetch request indicating to position the cursor on a plurality of rows of the result table; and positioning the cursor on the plurality of rows of the result table indicated in the fetch request that satisfy the search criteria.

The Examiner cited paras. [0006] and [0079] of Bonner as teaching the claim requirement of receiving a fetch request indicating to position the cursor on a plurality of rows of the result table. (Office Action, pgs. 5-6) Applicants traverse.

The cited para. [0006] mentions that when a cursor is opened, the current row position is the first record in the result table. The application may then issue fetch commands to move the

current row position and fetch forwards or backwards a number of rows. If the cursor is static, the result table is not updated and not effected by updates to the underlying base table.

Nowhere does the cited para. [0006] anywhere teach or suggest receiving a fetch request to position a cursor on a plurality of rows of the result table. Instead, the cited para. [0006] mentions positioning the cursor on one record, not a plurality of rows as claimed.

The cited para. [0079] mentions that once the result table is populated, the application may issue fetch statements to fetch rows from the result table or positioned delete and update commands to modify the rows in the result table.

The cited para. [0079] mentions how multiple commands, such as fetch, delete and update, may perform operations with respect to rows of the result table. However, nowhere does the cited parea. [0079] anywhere teach or suggest that the cursor be positioned on a plurality of rows of the result table. Instead, the cited parea. [0079] mentions how multiple commands may perform operations with respect to rows of the base table.

The Examiner recognized the above shortcomings of Bonner and cited col. 3, lines 24-26 of Bastawala as teaching the claim requirement of positiong the cursor on a plurality of rows of the result table indicated in a fetch request. (Office Action, pg. 6)

The cited col. 3 of Bastawala mentions that the current position of the cursor may point to a row or set of rows in the result set. Applicants submit that this statement does not teach the claim requirement of positioning the cursor on a plurality of rows. Batsawala discusses how the "current position of the cursor points at the last row fetched by the client". (Bastawala, col. 3, lines 26-30) Further, the cursor is scrolled to view rows in the result set before and after the current position. (Bastawala, col. 3, lines 30-37). Thus, the cited Bastawala mentions that moving a cursor may allow one to view rows of a result set. However, nowhere does the cited Bastawala anywhere teach or suggest that the cursor itself is positioned on a plurality of rows as claimed.

Other parts of Bastawala indicate that what is meant by the cited statement that the "current position of the cursor points at a row or set of rows" is that scrolling the cursor to one position causes the rows or set of rows corresponding to the current position to be retrieved and displayed. (Bastawala, col. 3, 40-50). Bastawala mentions that the display range corresponds to the cursor position, and that rows in this display range not in cache need to be fetched. (Bastawala, col. 5, lines 1-10 and 20-25) Thus, when Bastawala mentions that the cursor points

to a set of rows, Bastawala appears to be referring to the display region of rows displayed as the cursor moves forward and backward through the result set. For instance, Bastawala in many instances uses the phrase that the "the display range 210 corresponding to the new cursor position" (Bastawala, col. 5, lines 1-5, 20-25, 45-50) and that "based upon the present cursor position, the client cache 508 presently contains rows … of the result set" (Bastawal, col. 5, lines 60-65).

The Examiner has not cited any part of Bastawala that teaches that a cursor be positioned on a plurality of rows. Instead, the cited Bastawal discusses how a cursor is positioned at a row, which results in a number of rows from the result table including the cursor in a display range being displayed.

Further, nowhere has the Examiner cited any part of Bastawal that teaches that a fetch request indicates to position a cursor on a plurality of rows. Instead, the cited Bastawala discusses how a "display range" of rows corresponds to the cursor position because they are the rows that are displayed as a result of scrolling the cursor through the result set. The Examiner has not cited a fetch request that specifies that a cursor is positioned on multiple rows.

Accordingly, claims 1, 13, and 23 are patentable over the cited art because the cited references do not teach or suggest the combination of requirements.

] Claims 5-12, 17-22, and 27-34 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 13, and 23, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claims 5, 17, and 27 depend from claims 1, 13, and 23 and require that the cursor is positioned on a current plurality of rows of the result table before receiving the fetch request, and wherein positioning the cursor further requires: determining a rowset size and positioning the cursor on a number of rows with respect to one row of the result table having rows that satisfy the search criteria.

Applicants amended these claims, as well as claims 7, 19, and 29, to recite that the cursor is positioned on a number of rows comprising the rowset size. This requirement is disclosed on at least para. [0030], pgs. 13-14 of the Specification.

The Examiner col. 6, lines 59-67 and the previously discussed col. 3, lines 24-26 of Bastawala as teaching the claim requirements of determining the rowset size and positioning the

cursor on a number of rows with respect to one row of the result table. (Office Action, pg. 8) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 6 mentions that a tab indicates a position of the display within the result set and the size reflects the size of the display window compared to the entire result set. The size discussed in the cited col. 6 concerns the number of rows displayed in the display window. Nowhere is there any teaching or suggestion of the claim requirement of a rowset size indicating the number of rows on which the cursor is positioned. Instead, the size of the display window is the number of rows displayed, not the number of rows on which a cursor is positioned.

The cited col. 3 mentions that the cursor points at a row or set of rows. Applicants explained above that this statement refers to the rows in the display window displayed as a result of the current cursor position. As discussed, the cited col. 3 does not teach or suggest positioning the cursor on a plurality of rows. Instead, the cursor of the cited Bastawala is positioned at one row, which causes a number of rows in a display window to be displayed.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of amended claims 5, 17, and 27 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught in the cited combination.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 20, 28, 29, and 30 provide additional requirements concerning the positioning of the cursor on a plurality of rows. The Examiner cited the above discussed sections of Bastawala as teaching the requirements concerning the positioning of the cursor on a plurality of rows. (Office Action, pgs. 9-14) Applicants submit that the cited Bastawala does not teach or suggest a cursor positioned on a plurality of rows as claimed, or the claimed operations with respect to such a cursor. Accordingly, these claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

2. Claims 2-4, 14-16, and 24-26 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 14-16, and 24-26 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Bonner, Bastawala and Vicik (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,904).

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 13, and 23, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 14, and 24 depend from claims 1, 13, and 23 and further require placing a lock on the plurality of rows of the result table on which the cursor is positioned. The Examiner cited col. 2, lines 35-38 and col. 7, lines 13-17 of Vicik as teaching the additional requirements of these claims. (Office Action, pg. 18) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 2 mentions that cursors are used to set lock conditions, to control access to certain data. Nowhere does this cited col. 2 anywhere disclose the requirement of placing a lock on a plurality of rows on which the cursor is positioned. Instead, the cited col. 2 mentions generally that cursors are used to set lock conditions, but not the specific claim requirement of locking a plurality of rows on which the cursor is positioned.

The cited col. 7 mentions that a client lock setting on data within a result set affects the ability of clients to scroll through or update rows in the result set. Nowhere does this cited col. 7 anywhere disclose the requirement of placing a lock on a plurality of rows on which the cursor is positioned.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of amended claims 2, 14, and 24 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught in the cited combination.

Claims 3, 15, and 25 depend from claims 2, 14, and 24 and require that the fetch request is received from a client at a server, and further require returning, by the server, the plurality of rows at the server on which the cursor is positioned to the client that sent the fetch request, wherein the lock is placed on the plurality of rows at the server to block the plurality of rows on which the cursor is positioned.

The Examiner cited col. 5, lines 5-10 of Bastawala as teaching the claim requirement of returning, by the server, the plurality of rows at the server on which the cursor is positioned to the client that sent the fetch request. (Office Action, pg. 20) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 5 mentions that rows in the display range, rows 15-19, must be fetched from the server before the cursor is scrolled to the appropriate position. The rows being fetched are rows in a display range, displayed as a result of scrolling the cursor through the result table. Nowhere does the cited col. 5 anywhere teach or suggest that the returned rows are those on which the cursor is positioned. Instead, the cited col. 5 discusses fetching rows in a display range, not rows on which a cursor is positioned as claimed.

Accordingly, the additional requirements of amended claims 3, 15, and 25 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught in the cited combination.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-34 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 15, 2006

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984